

## REMARKS

### Incomplete Action

The Final Official Action mailed on February 5, 2008 is improper as it is incomplete. Note the requirements of MPEP 707.07(f) "Answer All Material Traversed": *"where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it"*. Here, the wording used by the Examiner in the "Response to Arguments" section is just an extract of the wording of selected sections of the previous action and no additional wording has been spent by the Examiner to address applicant's arguments. Applicants take issue with this kind of dealing with matters and respectfully request—at a minimum— a new, complete, action. The Examiner is respectfully requested to consult with his or her Supervisory Patent Examiner on this matter for guidance.

Notwithstanding the above, Applicants submit that the currently pending set of claims 1-17 and 37-40 is in condition for allowance.

### Szobonya

With reference to Szobonya, the Examiner has copied in the "Response to Arguments" section his previous admission that Szobonya neither teaches *"forming an intermediate blind hole"* nor teaches *"removing . . . sheet material [to] form[ing] a through hole containing [a] wire."*

Honestly, Applicants do not understand why this document is even being cited against the claims. The Examiner continues to justify his or her inability of finding such features by cutting-and-pasting in the "Response to Arguments" section the Examiner's opinion that the above features are "design choice[s]" that " [do] not bring unexpected results to the process." This is simply incorrect. Formation of a blind hole allows sintering between the sheet material and the wire over a larger surface, also including the bottom surface of the wire, which will contact the sheet material during the sintering process, differently from what would happen if a feed-through hole would have been immediately provided.

A second argument cut-and-pasted by the Examiner from his or her previous Action is based on the assumption that “removing sufficient sheet material . . . to expose the wire is notoriously well known in the industry to furnish final manufactured products by remov[ing] chips or unwanted materials” (see page 12 of the Action). This assumption, however, is defeated by the fact that Szobonya does not want that to happen! See column 3, lines 33-36 of Szobonya, where it is stated that “this eliminates the necessity of grinding down the top surface of either the terminal pin 10 or the base member 18 to bring these surfaces into alignment.” Therefore, it is clear that Szobonya teaches against a removing step.

#### Mizuhara and Chirino

Also in this case, the Examiner is just repeating himself or herself without any additional wording to help the Applicant understand where the Applicants’ arguments are allegedly flawed. As stated by Applicants in the previous response, neither Mizuhara nor Chirino teach “intermediate blind hole[s]” that are later made “through hole[s]” by removing sheet material.

The Examiner does not address this argument and does not explain to Applicants where, Mizuhara or Chirino show such feature. The Examiner is still using his or her previous argument that “it is notoriously well known in the industry to furnish final manufactured products by remov[ing] chips or unwanted materials.” However, this general observation should be applied to the facts of the case, i.e. to Mizuhara and Chirino. Given that Mizuhara does not disclose blind holes, as also acknowledged by the Examiner, the Examiner’s observation on furnishing should be apparently applied to Chirino. However, the Examiner is invited to look at Figure 6 of Chirino, for example, and explain to the Applicants why any person skilled in the art of sound mind would think of removing sheet from under the blind holes 15 to make them feed through holes! Such operation would render the whole structure in Chirino unsuitable for its purpose.

#### Others

The Applicants further note that the other rejections of the Examiner are posited either on Szobonya or Mizuhara + Chirino, which have been discussed above. Therefore, should the

Examiner find the above reasoning of the Applicants convincing, he or she should also withdraw the remaining rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance.

Should the Examiner not be willing to issue a Notice of Allowance, he or she is at least respectfully requested to issue a new and proper Final Action where his or her comments are spelled out with clarity and/or alternative wording to address the Applicants' arguments.

Fees

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 50-0922. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection herewith may be charged to deposit account no. 50-0922.


I hereby certify that this correspondence  
is being electronically transmitted on

May 1, 2008  
(date of deposit)



(signature of person transmitting)

Respectfully submitted,



Scott Dunbar, Esq.  
Reg. No. 37,124

Second Sight Medical Products, Inc.  
12744 San Fernando Road  
Building 3  
Sylmar, CA 91342  
(818) 833-5055 voice  
(818) 833-5080 facsimile